

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **August 25, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enoki et al. (USPN 5,873,085, hereinafter “Enoki”) in view of Shahabuddin et al. (USPub 2002/0143945, hereinafter “Shahabuddin”), and further in view of Shoroff et al. (USPN 6,381,602, hereinafter “Shoroff”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Enoki in view of Shahabuddin and further in view of Shoroff. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Enoki, Shahabuddin, and Shoroff teaches using an identifier to **identify a file** that is stored on a server (see Enoki, col. 17, lines 4-26 and Shoroff, col. 1, lines 26-38).

In contrast, the present invention assigns an identifier to a file that indicates **which virtual server** within a plurality of virtual servers stored the file (see page 7, line 23 to page 8, line 10 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows the virtual servers to co-exist on a single computing platform while maintaining ownership of their files. Note that an identifier similar to the one taught by Enoki, Shahabuddin, and Shoroff must also be included by the present invention to identify the files and to identify the individual or group that owns the files. This is not the same as indicating which virtual server stored the file. Hence, here is nothing within Enoki, Shahabuddin, and Shoroff, either separately or in concert, which suggests assigning an identifier to a file that indicates which virtual server within a plurality of virtual servers stored the file

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention assigns an identifier to a file that indicates which virtual server within a plurality of virtual servers stored the file. These

amendments find support on page 7, line 23 to page 8, line 10 of the instant application. Dependent claims 7, 14, and 21 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: October 14, 2004 .

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665